UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/955,361	09/18/2001	Fuad Rashid	SBL0010US	9514

60975   7590   04/27/2009
CAMPBELL STEPHENSON LLP
11401 CENTURY OAKS TERRACE
BLDG. H, SUITE 250
AUSTIN, TX 78758

EXAMINER
STORK, KYLE R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/27/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/955,361	RASHID ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	KYLE R. STORK	2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 February 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-20,22-39,41-58 and 60-77* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-20,22-39,41-58 and 60-77* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This final office action is in response to the amendment filed 19 February 2009.

2.   Claims 1, 3-20, 22-39, 41-58, and 60-77 are pending. Claims 1, 20, 39, 58, and

77 are independent claims.

The rejection of claims 1, 11, 14, 20, 30, 33, 39, 49, 52, 58, 68, and 72 under 35

USC 103 over Mack et al. (US 2002/0054115, filed 11 June 2001, hereafter Mack) and

further in view of Adobe® GoLive™ 5.0 User Guide (Adobe, 2000, hereafter Adobe),

and further in view of Hall (Core Servlets and Java Server Pages™, Prentice Hall, 2000)

has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

The rejection of claims 3-4, 12-13, 15-16, 22-23, 31-32, 34-35, 41-42, 50-51, 53-

54, 60-61, 69-70, and 72-73 under 35 USC 103 over Mack, Adobe, and Hall and further

in view of Ladd (Using HTML 4, XML, and Java 1.2, 1999, Que, hereafter Ladd) has

been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

The rejection of claims 5, 24, 43, and 62 under 35 USC 103 over Mack, Adobe,

and Hall, and further in view of Watters (US 5897645, filed 22 November 1996) has

been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

The rejection of claims 6-7, 25-26, 44-45, and 63-64 under 35 USC 103 over

Mack, Adobe, Hall, Watters, and Ladd has been withdrawn as necessitated by the

amendment.

The rejection of claims 8, 27, and 65 under 35 USC 103 over Mack, Adobe, Hall,

and further in view of Kwong et al. (US 6289506, filed 30 June 1998, hereafter Kwong)

has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

The rejection of claims 9-10, 28-29, 47-48, and 66-67 under 35 USC 103 over

Mack, Adobe, Hall, Kwong, and Ladd has been withdrawn as necessitated by the

amendment.

The rejection of claims 17, 36, 55, and 74 under 35 USC 103 over Mack, Adobe,

Hall, and further in view of Orbanes et al. (US 2002/0075311, filed 14 February 2001,

hereafter Orbanes) has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

The rejection of claims 18-19, 37-38, 56-57, and 75-76 under 35 USC 103 over

Mack, Adobe, Hall, Orbanes, and Ladd has been withdrawn as necessitated by the

amendment.

The rejection of claim 77 under 35 USC 103 over Mack, Adobe, Hall and further

in view of "XSL Transformations (XSLT) Version 1.0" (16 November 1999, w3c.org,

hereafter XSL) has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1, 11, 14, 20, 30, 33, 39, 49, 52, 58, 68, and 72 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mack et al. (US 2002/0054115, filed 11 June

2001, hereafter Mack) and further in view of <u>Adobe® GoLive™ 5.0 User Guide</u> (Adobe,

2000, hereafter Adobe), and further in view of Hall (<u>Core Servlets and JavaServer</u>

<u>Pages™</u>, Prentice Hall, 2000), and further in view of Rosenberg et al. (US

2004/0205616, filed 30 August 2001, hereafter Rosenberg).

As per independent claim 1, Mack discloses a method comprising:

- Migrating a Cartesian coordinate-based view to the tag field-based view, wherein

  the migration comprises:

  o   Identifying a first applet of the one or more applets wherein the first applet

      comprises one or more controls (paragraphs 0019-0020 and 0024: Here,

      a Java applet is identified to be converted to XML)

  o   Associating a first applet template with the first applet, wherein the first

      applet template comprises one or more characteristics of each of the one

      or more controls (paragraph s 0019-0020 and 0024: Here, twin servlets

      acts as templates, converting Java applets to XML, and conversely,

      converting XML back to Java applets)

  o   Linking the first applet template to a corresponding first Cartesian view

      applet in the Cartesian coordinate-based view, wherein the first Cartesian

      view applet comprises a Cartesian view control (paragraph s 0019-0020

      and 0024: Here, the operating buttons are in a Cartesian view (standard x-

      y coordinate space))

   o   Mapping the corresponding tag view control to the tag field-based view

       (paragraph s 0019-0020 and 0024)

Mack fails to specifically disclose modifying the Cartesian view control to produce

a corresponding tag view control, wherein said modifying matches characteristics of an

associated control of the one or more controls in the first template. However, Adobe

discloses adding control buttons to tag-based view (pages 306-307). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to

have combined Mack's method of converting applets to tag-based views with Adobe's

method of adding control buttons to a tag-based view, since it would have allowed a

user to interact with the tag-based data (Adobe: page 306).

Mack fails to disclose selecting a tag field-based view comprising one or more

applets. However, Adobe discloses selection of a tag-based view for displaying HTML

and Cartesian coordinate based view and the tag field based view are each configured

to provide user interfaces that display the same data (page 62: Here, the HTML Source

Editor tab allows a user to view and edit the HTML of a document, with HTML being a

tab-based language). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Mack and Adobe, since it would

have allowed a user to directly edit HTML source code (Adobe: page 62).

Hall discloses HTML containing one or more applets (pages 274-283: Here,

applets are embedded within an HTML document, which is a tag field-based language).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's

invention to have combined Hall with Mack, since it would have allowed a user easily embed applet code within a tag based-field document (Hall: page 275).

Mack further fails to disclose selecting a tag field-based view from a plurality of tag field-based views, wherein each of the plurality of tag field-based views is configured to serve as a model for converting a corresponding coordinate based view. However, Rosenberg discloses selecting a tag field-based view from a plurality of tag field-based views, wherein each of the plurality of tag field-based views is configured to serve as a model for converting a corresponding coordinate based view (Figure 8; paragraph 0048: Here, a first document in a coordinate based view is converted to second format, selected by a user, including tag field-based views via a set of format rules). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Rosenberg with Mack, since it would have allowed a user to convert coordinate views to a plurality of tag field-views.

As per dependent claim 11, Mack, Adobe, Hall, and Rosenberg disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Mack fails to specifically disclose adding controls to suit a user's needs. However, it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention that controls may be added to a template to expand the capabilities of the template to suit a user's needs. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add controls to a template to expand the capabilities of the template to suit a user's needs.

As per dependent claim 14, Mack, Adobe, Hall, and Rosenberg disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Mack fails to specifically disclose deleting controls to suit a user's needs. However, it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention that controls may be deleted from a template to remove excess capabilities from a template to suit a user's needs. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to remove controls from a template to tailor the capabilities of the template to suit a user's needs.

As per independent claims 20, 39, 58, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 1. Claims 20, 39, and 58 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 30, 49, 68, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 11. Claims 30, 49, and 68 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 33, 52, 71, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 14. Claims 33, 52, and 71 are similarly rejected.

5.   Claims 3-4, 12-13, 15-16, 22-23, 31-32, 34-35, 41-42, 50-51, 53-54, 60-61, 69-70, and 72-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mack, Adobe, Hall, and Rosenberg, and further in view of Ladd (Using HTML 4, XML, and Java 1.2, 1999, Que, Platinum Edition, Page 1004, hereinafter Ladd).

As per dependent claim 3, Mack, Adobe, Hall, and Rosenberg disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Mack fails to specifically disclose a field control. However, page 1004 of Ladd depicts

an applet with at least one field control. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have at least one field control because fields accept user input from the keyboard.

As per dependent claim 4, Mack, Adobe, Hall, and Rosenberg disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Mack fails to specifically disclose a non-field control. However, page 1004 of Ladd depicts an applet with at least one non-field control. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have at least one non-field control because non-field controls constrain user input.

As per dependent claims 12, 15, 22, 31, 34, 41, 50, 53, 60, 69, and 72 the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 3. Claims 12, 15, 22, 31, 34, 41, 50, 53, 60, 69, and 72 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 13, 16, 23, 32, 35, 42, 51, 54, 61, 70, and 73 the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 4. Claims 13, 16, 23, 32, 35, 42, 51, 54, 61, 70, and 73 are similarly rejected.

6.   Claims 5, 24, 43, and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mack, Adobe, Hall, and Rosenberg, and further in view of Watters (USPN 5,897,645—filing date 11/22/1996).

As per dependent claim 5, Mack, Adobe, Hall, and Rosenberg disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Mack fails to specifically disclose mapping the controls to specific sequence numbers.

However, Watters discloses in col. 11, lines 25-45 mapping controls to a sequence

number in order to allow successful processing of control record data.   It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use

mapping of controls to sequence numbers in order to allow successful processing of

control record data.

As per dependent claims 24, 43, and 62, the applicant discloses the limitations

similar to those in claim 5. Claims 24, 43, and 62 are similarly rejected.

7.   Claims 6-7, 25-26, 44-45, and 63-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Mack, Adobe, Hall, Rosenberg, and Watters, and further in

view of Ladd.

As per dependent claims 6, 25, 44, and 63, the applicant discloses the limitations

similar to those in claim 3. Claims 6, 25, 44, and 63 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 7, 26, 45, and 64, the applicant discloses the limitations

similar to those in claim 4. Claims 7, 26, 45, and 64 are similarly rejected.

8.   Claims 8, 27, 46, and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Mack, Adobe, Hall, and Rosenberg, and further in view of Kwong et

al. (USPN 6,289,506 B1—filing date 6/30/1998).

As per dependent claim 8, Mack, Adobe, Hall, and Rosenberg disclose the

limitations similar to those in claim 1. Mack fails to specifically disclose mapping the

controls to specific sequence numbers. However, Kwong discloses in col. 4, lines 5-25

mapping the applet to a specific sequence number.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use mapping of applets to sequence numbers in order to control execution order of Java directives to optimize performance.

As per dependent claim 27, 46, and 65, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 8. Claims 27, 46, and 65 are similarly rejected.

9.   Claims 9-10, 28-29, 47-48, and 66-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mack, Adobe, Hall, Rosenberg, and Kwong, further in view of Ladd.

As per dependent claims 9, 28, 47, and 66, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 3. Claims 9, 28, 47, and 66 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 10, 29, 48, and 67, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 4. Claims 10, 29, 48, and 67 are similarly rejected.

10.   Claim 17, 36, 55, and 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mack, Adobe, Hall, and Rosenberg, and further in view of Orbanes et al. (USPAP 2002/0075311 A1—filing date 2/14/2001).

As per dependent claim 17, Mack, Adobe, Hall, and Rosenberg disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Mack fails to specifically disclose providing one or more model view for a user to select from, wherein one or more selected model views correspond to the Cartesian

coordinate-based view. However, Orbanes discloses providing a Cartesian coordinate-based model view in order to provide a virtual perspective on the system. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide model views in order to provide a virtual perspective on the system.

As per dependent claims 36, 55, and 74, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 17. Claims 36, 55, and 74 are similarly rejected.

11.   Claims 18-19, 37-38, 56-57 and 75-76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mack, Adobe, Hall, Rosenberg, and Orbanes, and further in view of Ladd.

As per dependent claims 18, 37, 56, and 75, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 3. Claims 18, 37, 56, and 75 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 19, 38, 57, and 76, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 4. Claims 19, 38, 57, and 76 are similarly rejected.

12.   Claim 77 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mack, Adobe, Hall, and Rosenberg and further in view of "XSL Transformations (XSLT) Version 1.0" (16 November 1999, w3c.org, hereafter XSL).

As per dependent claim 77, Mack, Adobe, Hall, and Rosenberg disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Mack fails to specifically disclose associating a tag field-based view template with the tag field-based view and mapping the corresponding tag view control to the tag-field-

based template. However, XSL discloses associating a tag field-based view template

with the tag field-based view and mapping the corresponding tag view control to the tag-

field-based template (sections 1 and 5.4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention to have combined Mack and Adobe with XSL, since it would have

allowed a user to process and format tag-based data (XSL: section 1).

13.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-20, 22-39, 41-58, and 60-77

have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

14.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KYLE R. STORK whose telephone number is (571)272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kyle Stork/

Kyle R Stork   /Stephen S. Hong/
Examiner   Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Art Unit 2178   Unit 2178

krs